



Modal Assessment Results

March 2001



Modal Assessment Objectives

- Understand basic performance, impacts, and costs of individual alternatives
 - For the highway alternatives
 - compare between alternatives
 - refine (if necessary) connections and termini
 - For HCT alternatives
 - compare between alternatives
 - refine alignments for further consideration
 - * *Remember our objective with HCT is to determine if Sound Transit's Long Range Vision should be amended*
 - For transportation demand management
 - continue development of a core strategy



HCT Alternatives *Results*

- What did we learn about high capacity transit?



HCT Alternatives *Transit Ridership Summary*

| Transit | Crossing Lake Washington (daily) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| No Action | 40,000 |
| C1: Fixed-guideway HCT in SR 520 | 51,000 – 55,000 |
| C1: Busway HCT in SR 520 | 53,000 – 55,000 |
| C2: Fixed guideway on I-90 | 46,000 – 52,000 |
| C3: Fixed guideway HCT on Mid-lake | 49,000 |



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives

PM Peak Period Transit Ridership Crossing Lake Washington

| | EB (historical 'peak' commute) | WB ('reverse' commute) |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| No action | 9,100 | 6,300 |
| C1: Fixed guideway HCT in SR 520 | 9,600 – 10,700 | 8,000 – 9,600 |
| C1: Busway HCT in SR 520 | 11,200 – 11,400 | 9,300 – 10,300 |
| C2: HCT on I-90 | 9,300 – 11,000 | 7,500 – 8,500 |
| C3: HCT Mid-lake | 11,300 | 9,500 |



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives

Impacts

- I-90 crossing has least impacts
- SR 520 crossing has unavoidable parks & wetlands/habitat impacts at Montlake/Foster Island
- Mid-lake crossing would have construction impacts at portals
- All alternatives cross Sammamish River & Bear Creek



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives

Capital Costs (2001)

| Alternative | System | Lake Crossing | Total Costs | Mitigation/Enhancement | TDM Program |
|-------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------|
| SR 520 | Fixed Guideway | \$190 M | \$3.8 - 5.2 B | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| SR 520 | Bus Rapid Transit | \$340 M | \$3.7 - 4.8 B | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| I-90 | Fixed Guideway | \$90 M | \$2.6 - 3.3 B | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| Mid-lake | Fixed Guideway | \$1-1.3 B | \$3.9 - 4.2 B | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |

Costs do not include mitigation



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives

SR 520 Fixed Guideway Findings

- Westside networks serving U-District generate significant intra-Seattle ridership
- Eastside network focused on Bellevue CBD best serves both intra-Eastside and Crosslake markets
- Lake crossing costs relatively small portion of required investment
- High cost of Clyde Hill tunnel not justified by ridership gains



HCT Alternatives *SR-520 BRT Findings*

- Both service concepts result in similar ridership
- Capital costs and ridership for BRT similar to Fixed Guideway
- All options result in Westside bus volumes requiring large capital investment or high utilization of surface street capacity



HCT Alternatives *I-90 Fixed Guideway Findings*

- Requires significantly lower Westside investment
- Lake crossing costs relatively small portion of required investment
- Higher ridership achieved with direct Bellevue CBD routing
- Rail extension to Eastgate & Issaquah generates little new ridership compared to feeder bus and transfer at South Bellevue



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives *Mid Lake Fixed Guideway Findings*

- Lake crossing is high portion of capital cost
- Ridership similar to I-90 and SR-520
- High engineering and construction risk associated with deep underwater bored or untried floating submerged tunnel



Trans-Lake Washington Project

HCT Alternatives *Conclusions*

- I-90 has lowest cost and least environmental impacts with similar performance and should be advanced
- SR-520 alternatives avoid potential I-90 traffic impacts, have potentially higher intra-Seattle ridership and should be advanced.
- BRT alternatives have costs and ridership similar to Fixed Guideway and should be revised to use combined HOV/transit facilities where possible to reduce costs
- Mid Lake alternatives benefits do not offset high risks and costs and should be dropped



Highway Alternatives

- Alternatives Review
 - B-1 Minimum Footprint
 - B-2 1 HOV lane each direction
- I-5 express lanes to SR 202
 - B-3 1 HOV lane and 1 GP lane each direction
- same HOV lane configuration
- GP from SR 202 to Eastlake (Fairview area)
 - B-5 Bus only lanes
- same configuration as HOV lanes



Highway Alternatives Performance

Daily Trans-Lake Vehicle and Person Trip Volumes and Modal Split
Screenline A: SR 520 Only

| Roadway Facility | Daily Vehicle Volumes | | | | Daily Person Trip Volumes | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|------------|---------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | Non-HOV | HOV (3+) | Commercial | Total | Non-HOV | HOV (3+)/Bus | Total |
| No Action | 86,800 | 4,800 | 29,600 | 121,100 | 115,500 75.0% | 38,400 25.0% | 153,900 100.0% |
| Minimum Footprint | 86,900 | 4,800 | 29,600 | 121,200 | 115,500 75.0% | 38,400 25.0% | 153,900 100.0% |
| HOV Lanes (B2) Connection to I-5 Express | 89,400 | 11,500 | 30,000 | 130,900 | 119,000 57.6% | 87,600 42.4% | 206,600 100.0% |
| GP & HOV Lanes (B3) Added GP ends at Fairview/Eastlake and HOV connects to I-5 express | 131,200 | 12,700 | 41,200 | 185,100 | 174,500 64.5% | 96,200 35.5% | 270,700 100.0% |
| Bus and Vanpool Only Lanes (B5) | 87,300 | 3,900 | 29,400 | 120,600 | 116,200 69.4% | 51,200 30.5% | 167,400 100.0% |



Highway Alternatives *Impacts*

- Eight lanes has largest footprint - most impacts
- Minimum footprint has least impact
- Interchange option of cut and cover tunnel under Union Bay from Foster Island needs discussion with resource agencies



Highway Alternatives *Costs*

Conceptual Capital Cost Estimates (Millions of 2001 Dollars) Costs do not include mitigation

| Alternative | Mainline with Interchanges | Local Streets | Total | Mitigation/ Enhancements | TDM Programs |
|---|----------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------|--------------|
| B-1. Minimum Footprint | \$1,060 | \$10 | \$1,280 | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| B-2. HOV Lanes (I-5 Express lanes | \$2,440 | \$120 | \$3,050 | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| B-3. HOV and GP Lanes (HOV terminus | \$5,200 | \$550 | \$6,070 | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |
| B-5. Bus-only lanes (same configuration | \$2,440 | \$120 | \$3,050 | \$330 - 3,500 | TBD |